

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/552,583	ROLLER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Benjamin P. Lee	<b>Art Unit</b> 3641	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(1) Benjamin P. Lee.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Brian C. Anscomb.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 25 June 2007

**Time:** 11:50

**Type of Interview:**

- Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant  Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes  No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

*MICHAEL J. CARONE*  
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner contacted Applicant's representative to suggest amending claim 1 to teach away from the closest prior art by incorporating language that positively claims that the spring is a coil spring. Applicant's representative agreed to the making the amendment..